

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/576,037	03/15/2007	Orlei da Silva Choai	40146	9489	
PEARNE & G	7590 12/08/200 ORDON LLP	EXAMINER			
1801 EAST 97		CUMBESS, YOLANDA R			
SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND	OH 44114-3108		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3651		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/08/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/576,037	CHOAI, ORLEI DA SILVA		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	YOLANDA CUMBESS	3651		

	TOLANDA COMBESS	3631						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 16 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 3) The period for reply expires or. (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period value of 27 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), is avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to  a) They raise new issues that would require further cor  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
appeal; and/or								
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			•					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [         how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.</li> </ol>		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: 36-80.								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t before or on the date of Elina a Nie	tion of Annualill not	be entered					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant faile e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).								
13. Other:								
/Gene Crawford/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3651								

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants arguments are unpersuasive. In general, Applicant has interpreted the disclosure of Smither too narrowly. Particularly, Smither clearly discloses transfering material from the first transport means (C) to a second transport means (D)(Fig. 1-6) by rotating a cylinder body (15); wherein the bacon slices on the film material are held in place by a vacuum through a vacuum connection means (24) by sucking the film which holds the bacon slices towards the cylinder surface (Col. 3, lines 45-51).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior at to produce the claimed invention there there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the transfer devices of Smitches and Station which sequentially transfers flat articles using a vaccoum that is in fluid communication using pressurized air for enhanced flexibility and which can be operated easily and inexpensively (Smithers, Col 1, lines 58-687).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).